

Commissioner for Patents

SN 09/526,441

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failure to provide a detailed description for figure 5. In the response submitted on October 28, 2002, the amendment to the specification on page 10, line 24 is as follows:

It will be appreciated that the hardware cursor which is overlaid on top of the main display may also need to be scaled so that it can be seen on the secondary display. Alternatively, the hardware cursor can simply be BLIT (bit block transferred or copied) into the zoom buffer directly (see Figure 5).

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that a detailed description is provided for figure 5 and the objection is traversed.

The Examiner has agreed to approve figure 6 as per the proposed amendment in the response of June 10, 2003. Figure 6 is being submitted herewith.

The Examiner has pointed out that an inconsistency occurred in the amendment to page 11, line 12, where the first occurrence of "figure 8" should be "figure 7". The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this and has provided the appropriate correction to the paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 USC §112 for lack of proper antecedent for the term "main display surface" as a result of a previous amendment made to claim 15. The Applicant has amended claims 17 and 18 to correspond to the amendment made to claim 15.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 30 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Boger, US patent 6,515,678. In accordance with §1.131 of the Patent Rules, the Applicant hereby submits the enclosed declaration to establish invention of the subject matter of the rejected claims prior to the filing date of Boger, i.e. November 18, 1999. It will be noted that the appended declaration by Lorne Trottier establishes that the Applicant's invention had been released as a commercial product by June of 1999. The

Commissioner for Patents


SN 09/526,441

invention was conceived and reduced to practice well before this date. It is also clear that all of the features present in claims 1 and 21 of the pending application were conceived and reduced to practice well before November 18, 1999. Claims 2 to 20 and 22 to 30 are dependent on claims 1 or 21. Therefore, this reference is not citable under §102(e) and the rejection is traversed.

The Applicant believes that all issues have been addressed and the present application is now in good standing. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-30 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kamran AHMED et al.

By:



Robert Mitchell, Reg. No. 25,007

Ogilvy Renault  
1981 McGill College Ave. – Suite 1600  
Montreal, Quebec  
Canada H3A 2Y3

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the  
Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Robert Mitchell, Reg. No. 25,007

Name of person signing certification

  
SignatureDecember 8, 2003  
Date